

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### **1. Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102(a)**

Claims 1 – 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by applicant admitted prior art (AAPA).

5     Response

Claim 1

      Claim 1 has been amended to contain the limitations of “checking whether the interrupt request is a read command” and, when the request is a read request and data is stored in the buffer, transferring the data in parallel with the execution of the control  
10     procedure or operation. In the prior art, as supported by specification paragraph 20, all interrupt requests received during long operations / procedures will only be handled when the long operation or procedure is completed, i.e. they are handled separately from the control procedure or operation: “Only when the control circuit 122 has completed the routine procedure (step 208) according to the main loop of the firmware program code  
15     130 will the optical storage drive 120 respond to the interrupt request to interpret and handle the read command instruction\_B. Actually, not only in the seeking operation, but the interrupt request is also paused in all handling methods of the interrupt request when the optical storage drive 120 executes a control procedure or operation that needs a long time in the structure of the firmware program code 130”. Therefore, the stage of  
20     determining if the interrupt request is a read request is novel, because a positive determination allows the optical storage drive claimed in Claim 1 to perform the read request in parallel with the control procedure or operation. Such a stage is not anticipated by the prior art.

25     Therefore, the applicants believe that Claim 1 should be found allowable over the prior art.

Claims 2 – 5

Claims 2 – 5 are dependent on Claim 1, and should therefore be found allowable if Claim 1 is found allowable.

5

Claim 6

Claim 6 has been amended to contain the limitations of determining whether an interrupt request is a read command, and, if the determination is positive, transferring data to the control circuit in parallel with executing a control operation or procedure. For the reasons detailed in the response to Claim 1, the applicants believe Claim 6 should be found allowable.

10

Claim 7

Claim 7 is dependent on Claim 6, and should therefore be found allowable if Claim 6 is found allowable.

15

**2. New claims**

Claims 8 – 14 are based on original claims 1 – 7 respectively.

20

Claim 8

Claim 8 further claim that the control circuit comprises a first control circuit and a second control circuit, wherein the first control circuit is utilized for controlling the servo module to perform a seeking operation, and the second control circuit is utilized for transferring data of the interrupt. As separate circuits are utilized for performing separate operations, the two operations (namely the seeking operation and the handling of the interrupt request) can be performed in parallel. This is fully supported by specification paragraph 54: “the circuit for monitoring seeking operation of the servo module 140 and

25

the circuit for transmitting data to the host 110 are different and have no conflicts". In the AAPA, when an interrupt request is received during a long operation or procedure, the optical storage drive will only process the interrupt request after the operation / procedure is completed, as detailed in the response to Claim 1. Furthermore, Claim 8 contains the  
5 limitation that, when an interrupt is received, the optical storage drive will determine if the interrupt is a read request. For the reasons above and those detailed under the response to Claim 1, the applicants believe that new claim 8 should be found allowable.

Claims 9 – 12

10 Claims 9 – 12 are dependent on Claim 8 and should therefore be found allowable if Claim 8 is found allowable.

Claim 13

15 Claim 13 is based on original Claim 6, but further claims that the control circuit comprises a first control circuit and a second control circuit wherein the first control circuit controls executing a control procedure or operation and the second control circuit controls transferring data of the interrupt request in parallel. Furthermore, Claim 13 contains the limitation that, when an interrupt is received, the optical storage drive will determine if the interrupt is a read request. For this reason, and for the reasons detailed  
20 under the response to Claim 6, the applicants believe that new claim 13 should be found allowable

Claim 14

25 Claim 14 is dependent on Claim 13 and should therefore be found allowable if Claim 13 is found allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this

Appl. No. 10/711,996  
Amdt. dated May 18, 2007  
Reply to Office action of February 26, 2007

case.

Sincerely yours,

5 Winston Hsu

Date: 05.18.2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

10 e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)